## FILED

MAY 15 2018

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

SUSAN Y. SOONG CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

United	d States of America,	)	Case No. CR 18-Colb3 VC
	Plaintiff, v.	)	STIPULATED ORDER EXCLUDING TIME UNDER THE SPEEDY TRIAL ACT
ال	nmy Dartell Bowie Defendant.	)	
For the reasons stated by the parties on the record on May & H, 2018, the Court excludes time under the Speedy Trial Act from May & H, 2018 to May 22, 2018 and finds that the ends of justice served by the continuance outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A). The Court makes this finding and bases this continuance on the following factor(s):			
	Failure to grant a continuance See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(E		result in a miscarriage of justice.
	The case is so unusual or so complex, due to [check applicable reasons] the number of defendants, the nature of the prosecution, or the existence of novel questions of fact or law, that it is unreasonable to expect adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the trial itself within the time limits established by this section. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii).		
# SQUITTER STATE OF THE STATE O	Failure to grant a continuance would deny the defendant reasonable time to obtain counsel, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).		
	Failure to grant a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant continuity of counsel, given counsel's other scheduled case commitments, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).		
<u>X</u>	Failure to grant a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence.  See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).		
DATED: JOSEPH C. SPERO Chief Magistrate Judge			
STIPULATED: Attorney for Defendant Assistant United States Attorney			